

How unbelievable a statement could that be, since his own numbers—not somebody else's, his own numbers when he submitted the budget on Monday, the next day—showed that the lowest single deficit in any one of the 10 years was \$600 billion. He would have added \$13 trillion to the gross debt of the United States over 10 years and the numbers, the deficits were going up in the last 5 years—a totally unsustainable course.

Erskine Bowles, the head of the fiscal commission, was in shock, I think, when he saw this. He was appointed by President Obama to head the commission. He said this will take them nowhere near where they have to go to avoid the Nation's fiscal nightmare—nowhere near. And he was absolutely right about that.

Then he also said, on CNN on a different day, another interview, the budget “takes real actions now so that between now and 5 years from now, we can get our deficit under control so that we can stabilize things so we're not adding to the debt anymore.”

It had never come close to that. It is a horrible thing. He said this. I asked him about it before the committee. I read that very quote to him before the committee 3 days later and this is what he said. I asked him, is it an accurate statement, this statement right here? And he said:

It's an accurate statement that our current spending will not be increasing the debt. . . .

He went on to add:

We've stopped spending money that we don't have.

First of all, this Senate, this Congress, should defend the integrity of our process. We should not have high government officials come before our committees and before the American people and misrepresent in such a dramatic way the financial condition of our country. I called it then and I repeat now that this, I believe, was the greatest financial misrepresentation in the history of this Republic. If anybody has one that is bigger, let me hear it, but I don't think they will. I said that earlier today. You tell me—\$13 trillion added to the debt and they say we are not going to be adding to the debt anymore.

The budget was a terrible budget. It was a terrible budget. Editorial board after editorial board—the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, the Denver Post, the Dallas Morning News—there must have been 40 editorial boards that hammered this budget for failing to lead—the Wall Street Journal, Financial Times, Investor's Business Daily—they all hammered this budget because this was early in 2011, after the 2010 elections, after the shelling of the big spenders, and there was a hope somehow that we would be able then to get the administration to come around and change some things. But they stayed right with their big spending policies. They stayed right with it and they decided not to tell the

truth, that we are not backing down, we are going to continue to spend, we are not going to cut spending. They would not say that. This is what they said. Whereas their budget did just the opposite.

I feel strongly about this. This is not right. We in Congress should not have this kind of misrepresentation before us and we should not reward people who participate in such misrepresentation. He is the architect of the administration's calculated plan to misrepresent the budget, to not have a budget in the Senate, to not expose themselves any more than possible, to attack Republicans such as PAUL RYAN in the House, who actually laid out a plan that would change the debt course of America. That is what the plan was, and Mr. Lew was the architect of it and he executed it. Boy, what was it like, do you think, for him to be in the Senate, in the White House, and have to be told or asked: Would you go out and say this?

Mr. Geithner, Secretary of the Treasury—I ask consent to have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Geithner—and this is important, colleagues—Treasury Secretary Geithner came before the committee. He would not repeat these words. I questioned him. Of course he tried to avoid it but eventually when asked directly he honestly said: Senator, this budget will not put us on a sustainable path, exactly opposite of what Mr. Lew was saying.

I ask my colleagues to consider this. I ask them not to award the person who participated in so calculated a plan to misrepresent the financial condition of America and cause the American people to believe we had some sort of time that had the country on a sound path when we remain to this day on an unsustainable path that endangers working Americans.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I yield back all remaining time. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be. There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jacob J. Lew, of New York, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 25 Ex.]

YEAS—71

Ayotte	Graham	Murkowski
Baldwin	Hagan	Murphy
Baucus	Harkin	Murray
Bennet	Hatch	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Paul
Blunt	Heitkamp	Portman
Boxer	Hirono	Pryor
Brown	Hoeben	Reed
Burr	Isakson	Reid
Cantwell	Johanns	Rockefeller
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Cochran	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Landrieu	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Cowan	Levin	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCain	Warner
Feinstein	McCaskey	Warren
Flake	Menendez	Whitehouse
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Mikulski	

NAYS—26

Alexander	Enzi	Risch
Barrasso	Fischer	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Chambliss	Heller	Sanders
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	McConnell	Wicker
Cruz	Moran	

NOT VOTING—3

Begich	Lautenberg	Udall (CO)
--------	------------	------------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from West Virginia is preparing to speak, but I will speak if he is not ready.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from West Virginia is going to have the floor, followed by the Senator from Tennessee, and I wish to be recognized to make some remarks following the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

CONGRESSIONAL VETERANS JOBS CAUCUS

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, just over a year ago my good friend, Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois, and I launched a new caucus in the Senate. Our purpose was to bring attention to the problem of unemployment among our military veterans. Mark and I looked at everything the Department of Veterans Affairs and other government agencies were doing to help veterans find jobs. We believed the private sector needed to be more involved, so we created the Senate Veterans Jobs Caucus.

Today, the Senate Veterans Jobs Caucus is the Congressional Veterans Jobs Caucus. It is a bicameral, bipartisan group of 37 Senators and 46 House Members brought together by a shared commitment to the newest generation of veterans.

This week we are kicking off the caucus's activities for the 113th Congress with a "Day on The Hill." It is an event highlighting our work on behalf of veterans, and particularly our show-case program, "I Hire Veterans."

Not only will we be recruiting more Members of Congress to join our caucus, but we will also be enlisting more businesses to join the eight major corporate partners that have already joined our ranks. These corporations expect to hire about 200,000 veterans in the next 5 years.

The members of the Congressional Veterans Jobs Caucus are leading by example. We are hiring veterans to work in our Senate and House offices. My colleagues will probably see the signs as they go by our offices that say "I Hire Veterans." It is a logo displayed proudly in our offices—the same logo my colleagues will see in the businesses that share our commitment to veterans.

Our I Hire Veterans Program is basically our new yellow ribbon, a special welcome home and a commitment to serve those who have served our country in the most difficult and dangerous circumstances.

There is no sugarcoating the fact that the job market is tough, especially for our young veterans. Unemployment among these veterans has reached crisis proportions according to the latest data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Listen to these figures, if my colleagues will. They are astonishing. For veterans 18 to 24 years of age, their unemployment rate is 31.3 percent—31 percent. Even more staggering is the jobless rate for female veterans in that same age bracket of 18 to 24, and that is over 55 percent unemployment. The employment situation isn't much better for the National Guard and Reserves because employers are reluctant to hire somebody who may be subject to being called to duty, and this generation of National Guardsmen and Reserves are coming home from a decade of repeated deployment that, in many cases, interrupted or delayed their careers or education. Many of them are just now realizing how difficult it can be to jumpstart school or a career.

If we don't do something it is going to get worse. With more than 100,000 service men and women expected to re-enter civil life each year over the next 5 years, their challenge to find jobs is only going to intensify. Listen to the veterans, and we would be surprised when they tell us that sometimes the stress of finding a job in a tough economy can match the stress of combat in some of the most dangerous and distant places in the world.

Imagine for a moment that you are 21 and just back from the rugged streets of Kandahar, reunited with your family, and you are going up and down the streets of your hometown looking for a job week after week with no luck at all. That is real stress. That is pressure, and that is what more than 3 out of 10 of our young veterans are experiencing right now as we speak.

Like every generation of American warriors before them, today's veterans make great hires. They lead by example. They understand teamwork. They are flexible and open to change. They are tech savvy. And talk about performing under pressure—even in the most stressful situations, with limited resources, they get the job done.

After World War II, with the millions of American GIs returning home, President Harry Truman appointed GEN Omar Bradley to run the Veterans' Administration. Bradley was a popular choice, and his steely approach to helping veterans was widely admired. Bradley's marching orders to the VA were simple: "We are dealing with veterans, not procedures, with their problems, not ours."

You will find that same kind of commitment to today's generation of veterans in the Congressional Veterans Jobs Caucus.

It is simply unacceptable that when the courageous Americans who fight our wars finally get to come home, they have to fight for jobs. The Congressional Veterans Jobs Caucus is committed to making sure that does not happen.

America has said it is time to bring our troops home. After a decade of war and incredible sacrifice by our warriors, the homecomings are well underway. It is not always easy to come home from war. But the homecoming will be easier if we fulfill our obligations, and that includes making sure our fighting men and women come home to a job.

After all, as General Bradley said: "We are dealing with veterans, not procedures, with their problems, not ours."

I would ask all of my colleagues here—we have 37 of our Senators signed up to this Veterans Jobs Caucus—I would hope we would have 100, and we are going to be working hard for that. I want to thank my good friend Senator MARK KIRK from Illinois for helping launch this. We have worked together. We will continue to work with all of our Senators. We appreciate and thank you.

• Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, more than 2 million Americans have served our

Nation in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other post-9/11 missions around the world. Now, as these men and women return home, they are confronting yet another challenge—finding a job.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, unemployment among younger veterans has reached staggering proportions. Nearly one-third of all veterans aged 18–24—and more than half of female veterans in that range—are unemployed.

Roughly 800,000 veterans call Illinois home. And in 2010, Illinois' veteran unemployment rate was the fourth highest in the country.

That is why I joined with my good friend and colleague, Senator JOE MANCHIN (D-WV), in forming the Congressional Veterans Jobs Caucus. And 1 year later, 35 Senators and 46 Representatives from across the political spectrum have joined the effort.

We are bringing together government and business leaders, veteran service organizations, and educational institutions to identify solutions to reduce vets' unemployment. And I am proud to report that several Illinois employers, such as State Farm and Caterpillar are stepping up to help.

At a time when so many see a divided government, we owe it to our veterans to cast aside our differences and work across the aisle to help solve this problem. •

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A FILIBUSTER AND A MOTION TO CUT OFF DEBATE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I come to the floor to attempt to clear up some confusion about Senate procedure. The confusion I wish to address is that some observers of the Senate seem to have a hard time telling the difference between a filibuster that is designed to kill the nomination of a Cabinet member or a judge and a motion by the majority leader to cut off debate. Let me say that again—the difference between a filibuster that is designed to prevent the nomination of a Cabinet member or a judge on one hand or a motion by the majority leader of the Senate to cut off debate.

There is a big difference. But sometimes I read in the newspapers that Republicans are filibustering, for example, Senator Hagel, as if a majority of Republicans or a majority of the Senate intended to deny the confirmation of Senator Hagel through a filibuster, when, in fact, what most of the Republicans were saying was: The nomination of the former Senator has come to the floor only 2 days ago. We have Senators who have legitimate questions about the nomination, and we wish to have some time to discuss it.

In that case, we were forced to have a vote on a motion by the majority leader to cut off debate on Thursday before the recess, even though the